

## LETTER VII.

To the *EARL of LIVERPOOL*,

*On the part which America is likely to take in a War between England and France.*

MY LORD,—From several parts of America I have received thanks for my Letters to your Lordship on the subject of the American war. The people in America think, or, at least, many of them think, that those Letters had great weight in producing the peace of Ghent, than which you and your colleagues never adopted any measure more wise nor in better time. Yet, *you* have never thanked me for my advice. You, to whom the peace was much more necessary than to Mr. MADISON, have never acknowledged your obligations to me. You have appeared to be sulky with me, though I taught you so exactly what to do, in order to avoid the great evils which were coming upon you from all quarters. The consequences of the American war were foretold by me nearly two years before the war began. I told you that you would have war, if you persevered in seizing men on board of American ships on the high seas. You did persevere; and you had war. I told you that the Americans would beat you in fighting, if you continued the war for two years. You continued the war, and they did beat you. I told you, that you would never have peace, if you demanded any concession from America. You insisted on great concessions on her part as a *sine qua non* of peace; and, after three months more, you made peace by giving up every thing, not excepting the *sine qua non* itself. In short, you expended fifty millions of money, and lost, I dare say, thirty thousand men, in accomplishing nothing, except creating a navy in America, causing her manufactures to flourish, and implanting in the hearts of Americans, for ages, a hatred of the English government.

I remind you of these things, in order to bespeak your attention on the present

subject. I shall here deal in prophecies again; and shall not be at all afraid of proving, in the end, to have been a false prophet. You appear to me now to be in a very fair way of adding another six hundred millions to our debt, and of bringing the guinea up to forty shillings, instead of twenty-eight shillings, at which point it is now arrived. I wish to prevent this; and, if I do not succeed, I shall, at any rate, have these pages to refer to, when the mischief has taken place, and when few besides myself will be able to say that they did all in their power to prevent it.

I am of opinion, that France alone is now, as she was in 1793, more than a match for the coalition against her. But, I am further of opinion, that, before the war against her be six months old, *you will see America taking a part in it*, unless you carefully abstain from every thing that can be construed into a violation of neutral maritime rights.

War, or peace, with America, will depend upon the opinions of the *people* in that country. The people there are really and truly represented in the Congress. There are no vile *sham* elections in the United States. That which the people wills will be done. The Americans are a *sensible people*; they all read from a press which is *really free*; they discuss all political matters freely. They love peace; they would prefer peace; they would make some sacrifices to peace; but they will never hesitate a moment in preferring war to slavery or dependance.

Now, then, what is likely to be the view which the Americans will take of the present scene in Europe? And what are likely to be their feelings with regard to what is passing in this quarter of the world? It is very easy for our corrupt press to persuade the alarmed and selfish part of England that it is necessary to plunge the country into war, in order to root out the present government of France. But, it will not be so easy for any body to persuade the American people that such an undertaking is just. They will see the matter in its true light. They will see that

Napoleon has been replaced at the head of the government by the will of the people of France; they will see that he has had the wisdom and virtue to abandon his ambitious projects; they will see that he has voluntarily confined himself within the ancient limits of France; they will see that he has tendered the olive branch to all surrounding nations; they will see that he means to contend solely for the independence of France; they will see that he has returned, as nearly as circumstances will permit, to the principles of 1789; they will see that he has provided for the people being *really represented* in the Legislature; they will see that there is to be no religious persecution, and no predominant church in France; they will see that the French people have derived great benefits from the revolution, and that now all these benefits are to be confirmed to them; in France they will see *a free people*, and in Napoleon they will see *the Soldier of Freedom*.

On the other hand, they will ask what right England, or any other power, can have to interfere in the internal affairs of France; they will ask why England should not treat with him now as well as at Amiens; why not treat with him as well as with the Directory at Lille. They will ask why England should refuse to treat with him, from whom she received the Islands of Ceylon and Trinidad. They will ask what can be the *real* object, the *ultimate* object, of a coalition of those powers who were assembled at Vienna, and who were disposing of states at their pleasure.

The Americans have seen the republic of Genoa given to the King of Sardinia; they have seen Poland parcelled out between Prussia, Russia, and Austria; they have seen the fleet of Denmark taken away; they have seen the people of the Republic of Holland sunk into the subjects of a King; they have seen the Republic of Venice transferred to the Emperor of Austria; they have seen the Pope replaced with the Jesuits at his heels; they have seen, that, in Spain, where a free constitution had been formed by men who had been fighting on our side, the King has been brought back; that he has destroyed this Constitution; that he has treated the makers of it as traitors; that he has re-established the inquisition which Napoleon had abolished; that when two

of the alledged traitors took shelter in Gibraltar, they were given up to their hunters, and that when complaint of this was made in our parliament, the reply was, that "*we had no right to interfere in the domestic affairs of Spain.*" The Americans will ask, why this principle is not applied to the domestic affairs of France. They will ask, not for vile, foul-mouthed abuse of Napoleon and the French people; but for some *proof* of our right to interfere against him.

Having seen all these things; having seen what we and our Allies have been at in every part of Europe; having seen that the people of France is the only people in Europe living under a government approaching towards a resemblance to their own, they will want very little to assist them in forming a correct opinion as to the real object of the war against France, if such war should now, without provocation on the part of France, be resolved on.

It appears to me, therefore, that the American people will, at least, feel great interest in this war, much greater than they felt in the last war; and, that as they have just laid down their arms, after a contest in defence of their maritime rights, they will, the moment they hear of this war, prepare again for that defence. America, in all likelihood, will again be the only neutral nation. There will be no *Milan and Berlin Decrees* to give a pretence for *Orders in Council*. So that, if we trench upon her rights, her ground of war will be cleared of all confusion. She will stand upon her *indisputable* rights. And, if she be left in the full and free enjoyment of her advantages as a neutral power, she will carry on three-fourths of the commerce of the world. Our cruizers may keep at sea, but it will be only to witness the increase of her mercantile marine, and all the proofs of her wonderful prosperity. France will receive all that she wants from foreign countries by American ships. America will supply her with colonial produce, and with certain articles of manufacture. The latter will, through the same channel, find an outlet for much of her abundant produce. These two countries will become much more closely connected than ever, and we should come out of the war shorn of our means, while the means of all sorts of America would be found to be prodigiously increased.



But, my Lord, is it *quite certain* that the people of America would not feel strongly disposed to take part in this war against us? They see that France is the only country left with a government resembling their own. Great as is their distance from Europe, they have felt, that, when left to be dealt with single-handed, their very existence, as an independent nation, was put in jeopardy. There were many persons in America, who loudly blamed the President, Washington, for not taking part with the French, even when America had not a single public ship of war. They reasoned thus:—that England was, from the nature of her force, as well as the situation of her dominions, the only enemy that America had to fear; that she had never ceased to demonstrate a hostile mind towards America; that she saw in America not only a successful example of democratic revolution, but a dangerous rival in commerce and maritime power; that she only waited for a *favourable moment* to use all her force to crush this rising rival; and, *therefore*, it was less dangerous to declare, at once, for the Republic of France, and make common cause with her, than to wait the issue of the contest, in which, if France should fall, America could not long survive without, at least, another long and bloody war upon her own soil.

This was the reasoning against neutrality in 1793. How these reasoners must have triumphed in 1814! When they saw all ground of dispute between England and America removed by the close of the war in Europe. When they saw, that, instead of this producing in England a disposition to make peace, it only produced redoubled activity in the war. When they read, in the very same English newspapers that told them of the abdication of Napoleon, that **NOW, NOW, NOW!** was the happy moment for crushing America; for putting an end to “the existence of the *mischievous example of democratic rebellion*” exhibited in the American Union. When they heard their President and the majority of the Congress denominated, in these same papers “*rebels and traitors*.” When they saw, in the report of a speech of a Lord of the Admiralty, that Mr. MADISON was to be *deposed*, as Napoleon had been deposed. When they saw the breaking up of the American Union represented as absolutely necessary

to the well-governing of other nations. When they saw the fleet called upon officially by the Lords of the Admiralty to finish the American war in such a way as would *insure the LASTING TRANQUILLITY OF THE CIVILIZED WORLD*. When they heard the English prints call upon the people of New England to separate themselves from the Union. When they heard it predicted, in these prints, that Mr. MADISON would be put to death, and that the people would *form a connection with the PARENT state*. And, when, upon the heels of all these predictions and threats, they saw an army actually sent off *from France* to fight against America; when they saw that identical army, which had been engaged against Napoleon, sent to invade America by the way of Lake Champlain; when they saw the war of fire and plunder carried on upon their sea-coast. When those who were for war on the side of the French Republic, in 1793, saw all these things in 1814, how they must have triumphed!

America must feel great confidence in herself from her past achievements. The skill and bravery of her seamen and land-troops must give her great confidence. But, there is no man who reflects (and the Americans are a reflecting people) who will not perceive, that, with all her valour and all her virtue, America has had a very narrow escape; and, that, if all had been *quite settled* in Europe, she would have had to carry on a much longer and more bloody contest. It cannot but be evident to the American Statesman, that, if France were to be completely subdued; if she were reduced to that state to be obliged to receive a ruler dictated by us and our allies; if her hands and feet were thus tied for ages; and, if the situation of all Europe were such as to leave the whole undivided power of England to be employed against America, the situation of the latter would be, at least, very *unpleasant*, not to say *precarious*. And, if such a person considers what were the *real objects* of England in 1814, the manner in which the war terminated, and what an *excellent memory* she has, he must be a bold man indeed if he feel no apprehensions at the total subjugation of France.

It has not been forgotten in America, that, directly after the abdication of Napoleon, there appeared an article in our

newspapers, stating, that there was a **SECRET ARTICLE** in the **TREATY OF PARIS**, stipulating, that *none* of the parties, Russia, Prussia, Austria, and France, should interfere in our war against America. This news was given as copied from the *Vienna Gazette*. The *Vienna Gazette* is under the immediate controul of the government there. The Americans paid great and deserved attention to this; and, must they not have lamented to see France reduced to such a state? They afterwards saw, that there was no safety for their ships of war or their prizes in the ports of France. They saw, in short, that the Bourbons, holding their power almost at the mercy of England, afforded not the smallest hope of any support against so formidable a power as England. Then it was, that many Americans blamed Mr. **MADISON**, not for resisting the exercise of our alledged right of impressment; but, on the contrary, for not having *sooner* made war against us in alliance with France. They told him, that he was, at last, in a state to be able to appreciate the *wisdom* of keeping aloof from France on account of the *title* of her ruler. They laughed at him for his scruples to make common cause with an Emperor, while he saw England having allies in the Turk, the Pope, the Algerines, and the Indians; and they laughed at him the more, when they recollected, that America had won her independence while in an alliance offensive and defensive with a Bourbon King of France.

However, many of the causes which kept America aloof from France are now removed. The principles of 1793 are again adopted in France; the system of reforming by means of conquest is abandoned; Napoleon will have learnt how to respect the rights and to value the character of America. *Experience* has taught the Americans what they have to expect under certain circumstances. The latter are in no danger from France; they never can be in danger from France; and, Frenchtown and Alexandria will remind them what danger they are in from England.

It is said, by some persons in America, that, though it might have been wise to seek permanent security in 1793, by entering into the war on the side of the Republic of France, it would not be wise *now*, seeing that America has become so

much more able to defend herself than she was in 1793, a proof of which she has given in her recent war against the *undivided* force of England. On the other hand, it is contended, that, though America be so much more powerful than she was in 1793, England, loaded as she is with debts and taxes, is more formidable than she would have been in 1793, even if she had then subdued France; for, though the *people* of England suffer, the *government* has more force at its command; and, what is more for its advantage, the country is brought into that sort of state which makes *war almost necessary*. If her paupers have increased three-fold, her armed men and her means of destruction have increased five-fold. She is become a nation of fighters. She possesses all the means of destroying. And, say these reasoners, it is not only subjugation against which America ought to guard: it is her duty to guard herself also against devastation and plunder. Besides, say they, England has now less powerful motives to the exercise of forbearance towards America. While the latter was without manufactures; while England had almost a monopoly in the supplying of America: the former saw in the prosperity of the latter the means of augmenting her own riches and power. But *now* the case is different; England sees in America even a manufacturing rival; and, what is still more provoking, she sees in America a rival in *naval power* and renown. Therefore, say they, she must and she will desire our destruction; whether she will attempt it again will depend upon her and our means of attack and resistance.

It must be confessed, that our infamous newspapers have given but too much reason to the Americans upon this head. For, they have published lists of the American navy and accounts of the American shipping and manufactures; and, having dwelt upon their magnitude and on their rapid increase, they have called upon your Lordship and your colleagues to prosecute the war for the purpose of destroying these evidences of rising power and wealth. They have contended, that it was just to carry on war against America to destroy her navy; to destroy her shipping and manufactures; and to obtain, at least, a stipulation from her, *not to build ships of war beyond a certain number and a certain size*. They have contended that such a



war would be *just*; that we should have a *right* to impose such conditions; and that *our safety* demanded that we should.

If I am told, that these are the sayings of a set of foolish writers in newspapers, my answer is, that I have seldom seen any of these people promulgate any political opinion without its being, in the *sequel*, very clear to me, that it was not in their own foolish heads that the sentiment had been hatched. These men are, in fact, nothing of *themselves*; they have no principles, no opinions; they care nothing about the matter. They are the mere tools of those who speak through them, whom they not unfrequently despise, but from whom, and through the means of whom, they live comfortably and sometimes get rich.

Upon the whole, therefore, my Lord, it is not to be apprehended, that, if we make war upon France for the avowed purpose of deposing Napoleon, the people of America will feel a strong disposition to take part with France in that war? And, if they were so to do, have we not great cause to fear, that the war would be extremely injurious to us by sea as well as by land? The American privateers, though without a port to take shelter in on this side of the Atlantic, did great mischief to our commerce even in the Channel. What, then, would they do if all the ports of France were open to them and shut against us? If, in short, America were in alliance with France, what English ship unarmed could hope to escape capture? And, is it to be hoped, that, in such a case, the skill, the discipline, and undaunted bravery of the American navy would not be communicated to that of France? Emulation might do a great deal towards sending forth fleets able, in a short time, to cope with those of England. Really, if we wish to keep these two nations asunder, it appears to me, that we have no way of accomplishing the wish but that of keeping at peace.

If America were to join France in the war, we should, doubtless, tell her, that she was acting a very base part; that she had received from us no provocation; that we had not meddled with her; that we had expressed our anxious desire to live at peace with her. But, my Lord, might she not answer?—very true; and you have received no provocation from France; France has not meddled with you; France

has expressed her anxious desire to live at peace with you: and yet, you have gone to war against France: if, therefore, it be base on my part to make war upon you, after you have begun war upon France, where is your justification for having begun that war? Besides, have you no ally? You boast of having all Europe on your side. And shall France have no ally? Shall you have twenty allies against the old ally of America, and shall it be deemed base in America to become the *only ally* of France? You say, that yours is a war of *precaution*: so is mine. You fear that *Napoleon may*, one day or other, get to London; and you have been at Washington, at Frenchtown and at Alexandria.

It is a favourite saying, or it used to be, in America, that it was her true policy to *keep aloof from European politics and wars*. General Washington several times expressed this sentiment. But *can* she do it? If General Washington had seen the Congress House in flames, the other day, and had seen our people so busy in packing up goods at Alexandria, he would, I imagine, have begun to think, that it was not so easy a matter to keep aloof from European wars; and, if he had lived to be made acquainted with the famous Captain HENRY's exploits, I think he would have had his doubts as to the possibility of keeping aloof from European politics. Even we, in England, say, that *America should keep at peace*, though we ourselves are always at war in some part or other of the world; though there is no war, in which we have not a hand. The truth is, that America *must* take a part in the wars and politics of Europe. Here are powers in Europe who can reach her, who have colonies in her neighbourhood, who have an interest, or think they have an interest, in injuring her. They combine and co-operate with one another; and she must form alliances too; or, she cannot be many years an independent nation.

It was impudently asserted, not long ago, that America had acted a *foul* part towards us, in the war; and she was called an *assassin*, who had attacked us in the *dark*. I was pleased to hear, from *such a quarter*, a sentiment of *abhorrence* against *assassins*; but, I was displeased to hear such an act attributed to America; because no charge was ever more false. It is notorious, that America used every

effort, and made every sacrifice short of a surrender of her independence, to maintain peace with England; and, that, so far from attacking us in the dark, she gave us notice, for years before-hand, that she would repel by force our seizure of her seamen, unless we ceased that practice. What, then, could be meant by this charge of assassin-like conduct? Really, we seem to have taken into our heads, like the cock on the dunghill, that *all the world was made for us*; that no nation is to form an alliance, nor even to think of defending itself by its own arms, if we disapprove of it. When our interest, real or imaginary, is in question, the interest of no other nation is to be thought of. The question with America, according to this presumptuous whim, was to be, not whether she suffered injury; but merely whether it was conducive to our interest to impress her sailors. If it was useful to us to do this, she was to deserve annihilation if she did not quietly submit to it, and to all its cruel and degrading consequences.

We proceed upon the same notion with regard to alliances amongst foreign powers. What! America make alliances with any power but us! Dreadful presumption! Presumption which merits all the weight of our vengeance! What! America seek safety, when we think it best to keep her in continual danger! America make an alliance for the purpose of defending herself against us, whose public writers, at least, devoted her chief magistrate to the gibbet, and herself to a return under the mild protection of "the PARENT state!" Nor are there wanting writers in America to hold the same language; but they are met by men, who are able to contend against them. *There* the press is free, really free; and, there truth will prevail.

A good specimen of this insolent way of talking was given by Sir John Cox Hipsley, who at a late county-meeting in Somersetshire, said, that the Americans, or at least, their President and the majority of the Congress, were *the slaves of the late tyrant of France*, a proof of which they had given in their late war against us. So, because America, in defence of herself, went to war with us, while we were at war against Napoleon, she was to be deemed the *slave of Napoleon*, who had no power to hurt her, and who had never called on her to go to war in his behalf.

She was to stop till our war with him was at an end, before she sought to defend herself. It was *baseness* in her to assert her own rights, at the end of many years of complaints, because we were at war with Napoleon.

This insolent language, my Lord, is little calculated to heal the wounds of America. She will, in spite of all we can say, reflect on her past danger, and she must have lost her usual wisdom in profiting from experience, if she does not now seek the means of security betimes. That, with all her natural reluctance to war, she will be disposed to do this I am certain; and, it will, I imagine, require but a slight provocation to induce her to act upon that disposition. It has been announced to us, that Switzerland has been informed, that there are to be *no neutrals* in this war against Napoleon. Hamburgh, Tuscany, Genoa, and several other states felt the effects of such a principle during the first war against Republican France. Denmark felt those effects during the last war. America will consider of, and judge from the past; and, your Lordship may be assured, that she will not want the means of doing what her permanent safety shall manifestly demand.

I have thus, my Lord, stated to you what I think will be the view that the people of America will take of the present scene; what I think will be their feelings; and I have pointed out the consequences, which I apprehend from those feelings, if we enter upon the war against France on the ground which is at present set forth. The Americans, I repeat, are prone to peace, as every uncorrupted nation is; but as it was said, the other evening, that it was better to go to war now with a strong alliance on our side, than be compelled to go to war at the end of an exhausting armed peace without allies; as this was deemed triumphant reasoning, in England, in behalf of offensive war, you must not be surprised if it be imitated, in America, in behalf of a war of defence.

I am, &c., &c.,

WM. COBBETT.

Botley, May 6, 1815.

#### LEGITIMATE SOVEREIGNTY.

MR. COBBETT.—Is not the present preparations for war against France, for the purpose of ousting from the throne of a



people's confidence and affection, a man who, of all potentates that ever lived, has perhaps the best title to that distinguished situation, truly abominable? The nineteenth century will be for ever disgraced in the page of history for affording an example of a race of men that could have been so criminally abject as to recommend so iniquitous, so servile a piece of treason against the social rights of man. The monstrous injustice of such execrable practice sickens every sense of virtue, and renders life itself almost insufferable. The natural feelings of the human mind, uninfluenced by the immorality, public and private, that has been engendered by the profligacy of the age, must *revolt* at the spoliating proceedings of modern times. Individual robbery is visited by the penal infliction of the law; but an authority setting itself above all law, will despoil whole nations, will dissolve all ties and obligations on which the moral and social character of man essentially depends, and is not held amenable to any tribunal; nay, it is even applauded by the corrupt tools of licentious power as having conducted itself *magnanimously!* It would be easy to prove that no individual living can assume to himself, in his own right, as all despots avowedly do, the sovereign power. This authority is inherent in the people that may be incorporated into a nation, and *equally* emanates from every individual in that social assemblage. For the benefit of the whole, the aggregate of this individual power may be conferred on any person that may be the object of preference, to carry the high authority thus confided into effect for the advantage of the nation. The person exercising this sovereign power is a sovereign *legitimately delegated*, and may act as such with all the consideration that may be due to the people whose suffrages he represents. Where, but in France, and America are to be found heads of governments of this rightful stamp and authority? The French people in the ardor and gratitude of their love and attachment to Bonaparte have conferred on him an imperial throne: a throne the first in intrinsic worth on the face of the globe, and one, which a generous and high minded nation of thirty millions of people, it may be fairly hoped, will cause to be duly respected. A throne, that may be truly regarded as the edifice of the people's own creation, must be

the darling object of their care and protection: a throne like that which exalts and adorns the person of Napoleon, is indeed truly enviable; it stands alone in sterling value; it is a precious unique in these enslaving and enslaved times; it is the throne of a free nation emanating from the sovereignty of the people, and intrusted to the revered and beloved Napoleon as the faithful guardian of civic rights, as the tried and approved repository of the inestimable charge. What will the French profit by this Imperial Constitution of National liberty? Why, instead of being governed by schemes of ancient but execrated vassalage, it will be ruled by the indefeasible axioms of the rights of man; the legislative authority will originate from the majority of the nation, where alone it legitimately exists. No unequal privileges can be claimed; the rights of the individual are those of the multitude; no distinction can arise in the administration of the laws; the Emperor is the first servant or magistrate of the people, and holds that high office no longer than he shall faithfully fulfil its inseparable duties. This is a scheme *novel* it must be owned, in these degenerate times. America only furnishes its counter-part. England has some pretension to its general principle in the provisions of *Magna Charta*, but the machinations, abuses, and sophistications incident to all social institutions have, through lapse of time, approximated its present government too much to the prevailing systems of Europe, (in which the sovereignty of the people is ridiculed rather than acknowledged and revered) to admit of being any longer likened to the sage and enlightened views of legislation, recognised and adopted in the French and American schemes of government. Napoleon, the author of this enviable amelioration in the French government, and Madison, his American co-partner in political wisdom, have been objects of unceasing aspersions and vilifications. They have been severally denounced and menaced with utter destruction. After the one was overthrown, by the influence of plots and treasons, the other was held to stand in the way of "social order, and "the blessed comforts of religion," and even the British government was called on to wield her power against the pestiferous evils of American liberty. The warlike preparations that are at present making,

have most evidently for their object the destruction of *French liberty*, overwhelming as that liberty must be, under the able direction of Bonaparte, to countries pining and sinking under the pitiless scourge of what is considered as *hereditary* and *legitimate* slavery. French liberty has a quality in it, with reference to surrounding nations eminently contiguous; its influence must spread. Like the electric fluid, it will diffuse itself. Some nations, indeed, to continue the electric simile, may be more ready *conductors* of it than others, according to natural and acquired capabilities; but none can permanently continue in a state of *non-conductors* of the sacred principle.

JUSTITIA.

#### LITERARY FUND AND WASHINGTON BENEVOLENT SOCIETY.

I have observed, that, year after year, this institution becomes more like a common *charity* concern. A parcel of Lords, and other men of *purse*, take the *chair*, and take the lead. This last meeting was, I see, presided over by the *Duke of Kent*, in the same way as the Lancaster school meetings, and other meetings for the assistance of the poor and miserable. The consequence of this must be, that the poor devil's *politics* will serve as the measure of the bounty he is to receive. The original design of this fund must be totally overlooked. That design, I believe, was to prevent authors from selling their pens; whereas now, I should suppose, the principal design to be to purchase the pens of authors, or to keep alive poor slaves whose works are well-meant towards their patrons, but destitute of the talent necessary to make them sell.—I observe, that the "*Founder's*" health was drunk, but, that the "*Founder*," Mr. DAVID WILLIAMS, was not *named*.—Mr. David Williams wrote some excellent political tracts in support of the principles of *freedom*; he also translated some of the works of Voltaire on the subject of *religion*. Never did he expect that his institution would tumble into such hands as have now got hold of it. The truth is, that the scheme was a very good one. Its object, and its tendency, was to encourage literary merit, and to make authors honest and independent; but it has now manifestly been converted into a sort of poor-

list for decayed literary hacks. They tell the world, that they do not publish the *names* of the parties who receive charity. They are very wise in this, for the public would soon see what the real object of the Fund was, if they could see the *names* of the persons relieved. In short, this, like almost every other "*Charity*," as they are called, is neither more nor less than an adjunct of the government, or, rather of the *System*. What Jacobin, or Jacobin's wife (unless she first betrayed her husband) was ever relieved by any of these societies? They are kept up for the purpose of keeping the needy in good humour, or of rewarding faithful decayed slaves. Here the man who has paid a fortune in taxes often comes, cap in hand, and receives back the means of getting a dinner. It is curious to observe, that the Aristocratic faction in America have resorted to a trick of this sort. They set up, some few years ago, a society, which they called the "*Washington Benevolent Society*," which, it appears, has branched out all over the country. The object of this trick was to collect little groupings of the most needy and mean-spirited part of the people, and, by the means of donations in money, clothes, books, or medical aid, to attach them to the aspiring rich, and thus to found a sort of affiliation against the Republican government. The name of *Washington* was taken for the purpose of deception, and as a party-word, opposed to the name of Jefferson or Madison, who were thus to be held up as having deviated from the principles of the man, to whom American gratitude has given what, perhaps, American wisdom and justice would have given largely, but certainly with a less prodigal hand. Availing themselves of this amiable weakness, these crafty enemies of their country's freedom have been working up the people here and there, by the means of these societies, to an opposition to the government. They hold their stated meetings, as our "*charities*" do. They make speeches, compliment one another, extol the virtues of Washington, who, though one of the first of patriots, never was fool enough to bestow his money in the making of paupers. Shut out of the Legislative Assemblies by the people's voice, they harrangue at these meetings, and thus continue to keep themselves in wind. Silly as the thing is, however, *in itself*, I would have the Ameri-



cans be upon their guard against it. It is aspiring Aristocracy in its most alluring guise; it is imposture of the most dangerous kind. It tends to the creating of *pauperism*; to the forming of a class in the community, who have no interest in supporting the rights and liberties of the nation, and who are to be bought and sold like cattle. These societies ought to be resolutely attacked and exposed. A little matter would break them up amongst a sensible people. I wish I could shew the people of America the effects of *pauperism* in England; I wish I could make them see the degradation which it has brought upon the land of their forefathers:—there would need nothing more.

#### WAR AGAINST FRANCE.

MR. COBBETT—There are some persons with whom it is in vain to reason, and whom it is impossible to convince. As a proof of this, the effects of prejudice and blind incredulity were never more palpably evinced than in the declarations, so repeatedly made, by most of the public journals, that the *army*, and not the *people* of France, are favourable to the return of Napoleon; that the nation at large has a perfect dislike to his name, character, and government; and that no proof of attachment by the people has yet been given, from the moment of his landing at Frejus to the time of his entering the city of Paris; no not even up to the present period. When such declarations as these are made, in the face of so many opposite facts, it is almost impossible for any evidence, however strong, to remove such deep rooted prejudice. What kind of evidence, short of a miracle, would be deemed sufficient to convince such wilful perverseness? It is not a little curious to see how they attempt to account for Napoleon's uninterrupted march to Paris. His landing, they tell us, was so sudden and unexpected; his movements so rapid and direct, that every loyal citizen was seized with a momentary astonishment. A paralytic affection deprived the nation of all motion, and all sense of feeling, except that a small disaffected rabble, the dregs of the military, basely attached themselves to the "vile tyrant," and conducted him to Paris! For a moment let us glance at the *moderation* and *modesty*, the *impartiality* and *candour* of these men, when

speaking of Napoleon. They call him a perfidious traitor, an audacious rebel, a vile miscreant, a run-away coward, a monster, whom every body hates, an enemy to tranquillity, happiness, and order, a hater of mankind, with whom no peace or truce can, or ought to, be made; and, to complete the climax, he is said to be a devil incarnate, but by which of the fallen angels he was begotten we are not yet informed. Doubtless they will next tell us he is Belzabub, the prince of the devils. These calumniators have a great facility in the use of these epithets. They apply them to all who think different from themselves. You, Sir, have very pointedly animadverted on their *modest* declamations against Mr. Madison, the American President. It was certainly a very pious avowal of theirs, that "the world should be delivered of such a democratic traitor," "and that no peace can or ought to be made with so rebellious a government." Much the same language was used in speaking of the immortal Washington, when that admired character directed the affairs of the most independent representative government in the world. Truth stands in no need of abusive language to support it. Such mean and contemptible expressions militate against the cause they are intended to serve. The *Moniteur* some time ago informed us that the loyalty of the French to the Bourbons was *universal*. Why then did not the Duke de Orleans, and the French Marshal who went with him to Lyons, excite the people of that great city to resistance? Opportunities have been afforded the people in various parts of France to prove their attachment to Louis, had they been so disposed. The exertions of the Duke of Angouleme, as well as his heroic Duchess, were incapable of rousing them to support their cause, notwithstanding they had *royal blood* in their veins, and tongues pouring forth rewards on all who heard them. It is notoriously true, that Napoleon landed with a little band of 600 men. While moving forward to the capital, why was he not arrested in his progress at Digne, at Gap, at Grenoble, or at Lyons, before his military strength became formidable? At neither of these places, nor at any other in the whole of his march, did a single individual oppose him. Can it be imagined, if such a force was to land in any part of Eng-

land, with the intention of subverting our glorious constitution, that it could proceed twenty miles without meeting a successful opposition, if not a total annihilation? Two months have elapsed since Napoleon's arrival in France. Still all remains tranquil. Time has been allowed to remove that astonishment, which, it is pretended, deprived the nation of all motion and sense of feeling. The wheels of government, through all France, proceed with the same regularity and order as though it had been of long standing. There appears to be no difficulty in making appointments to any office, or of forming institutions, which would do honour to any country. The abolition of the Slave Trade, and the establishment of popular Education; these two acts alone will hand Napoleon's name down to future ages with gratitude. Formerly he puzzled the Sovereigns of Europe by the splendour of his arms. Now he puzzles them by his moderation. He assures the world "he will not be the aggressor." That "his first wish is to become useful in establishing the repose of Europe;" to prove which he has sent pacific overtures to the different powers now arming against him. These powers have not disclosed the propositions. All that is known, therefore, respecting them, must be gathered from what he, or the French government, have said on the subject. France seeks no enlargement of dominion, nor desires to interfere with the internal government of other countries. She is willing to accede to the conditions entered into at the close of the war. What more is wanted? The sanguinary hirelings of the day inform us, that nothing short of Napoleon's life will satisfy them; that Europe and the world can be safe and happy only in his death. But bribes and rewards have as yet proved ineffectual to accomplish the pious design. Napoleon, they inform us, is so perfidious a character that he violates his treaties. Does this charge exclusively belong to the Emperor of France? Have no solemn engagements been disregarded by others? Napoleon and Murat, King of Naples, retort the same charge, with equal confidence, on the allies. If it is right to invade France because treaties have been broken, where is the country that may not be invaded? Again, the friends of war say, Napoleon is such a restless tyrant that no one can live in peace with him.

May it not rather be said that no one will be at peace with him?—Let the experiment be fairly tried. Even the honest ox, by constantly goading, will turn again. The war party confidently aver, that the combat once begun will soon, very soon terminate; that the overwhelming armies of the Allies will give no chance for the "tyrant's" escape. It is much easier to say what shall be done than to accomplish it. Let such silly advocates turn their attention to the state of France at the time the celebrated Duke of Brunswick entered that fine country with his inhuman Proclamation. It will be remembered that France was then disorganized, her councils divided, the army scattered; no rallying point to look at, and the people dissatisfied and tumultuous. Yet with all these disadvantages, the invading army was discomfited, beaten, confounded, and disgraced. The condition of France at this time will not bear a comparison. Its present advantages are infinitely superior to the former period. The kingdom is united. The army organised, and the resources great; so that they are in a condition to wage war with any who have temerity enough to combat with them. France has again exercised the unalienable right which every nation possesses. She has called Napoleon to the throne, and peace reigns throughout her vast empire. Millions rejoice at his arrival. Can any principle in equity justify a war which has no better foundation than *personal revenge*? Must the peace, order, and tranquillity of one of the finest countries in the world be desolated and distracted by a war faction, because one man lives? Is the naked spear to find a grave in slaughtered multitudes? Must the ravages of war kindle up a flame, and convulse all Europe, because one man exists who is obnoxious to us? The very idea overwhelms the human heart with terror and dismay—How tremendously awful will be the responsibility of that faction who encourages and commences the devastating carnage! Humanity bleeds at the anticipated prospect.—Yours respectfully,

MERCATOR.

#### ABDICATION OF BONAPARTE.

MR. COBBETT.—In the publication of the celebrated treaty of Fontainebleau, a treaty that will probably be regarded by



remote posterity as one of *hoaxing memory*, you judiciously observed, that the character, the tenor, and political importance of its terms with reference to Bonaparte, appeared to be such as better denoted a *conquering* than a *vanquished* power.—They certainly proved the military resources of the then imperial government of France, and evinced, that a dread was felt on the part of the Allies at putting to risk the possible issue of a protracted contest. Its continuance must indeed have been most sanguinary. Its cessation, therefore, by any conceivable means, was preferable to urging on the horrible work of carnage. Humanity owes the homage of gratitude to all the conflicting parties, for acceding to the pacific stipulations of the treaty of Fontainebleau. Whether that arrangement was founded on a *secret* understanding, that the abdication of the imperial throne was to be but temporary, is a circumstance with respect to the *public* articles, only to be vindicated by the *modern justification* that has been so often offered of state artifices and chicanery. Considering the bad faith with which the French Emperor had been treated by his former Allies, it was a sort of *ruse de guerre*, or rather *de paix*, which merits more properly to be regarded as an adroit piece of *lex tallionis* than as a flagrant instance of *mala fides*. But the warranty of Bonaparte for resuming the French throne, is affirmed to rest on a direct violation of the avowed conditions of that treaty. The non-performance of the stipulations respecting the Italian duchies to his Empress and Son, and the alleged design of wresting from him the sovereignty of Elba, are criminating proofs of the want of good faith in the contracting parties.—Independently of the voice of the French people, loud and heart-felt, in recalling their expatriated Emperor, his right to the throne of France is founded on a violation of treaty; so that what might have been a *moral* abdication had the conditions of obtaining it been observed, ceased to have any authority the moment these conditions were violated. It does, therefore, appear, that the throne reverts to him as his undoubted right, even were it not imposed on him by the free and universal acclamation of an approving people. No potentate on earth can have a better right to sovereign authority than Bonaparte. He is again

called to that high office by the very sovereignty of the people, the only legitimate source of magisterial appointment, and the undisguised terror and dismay of despots. It is now very generally, though absurdly enough, objected by the indiscriminating adversaries of the French Emperor, that the Allies were blameable, nay, almost criminal, in suffering so dangerous a person to be stationed so near the shores of France as in the island of Elba; that if circumstances did not exactly admit of putting him to death, yet the least that could have been done with him, consistently with the security of Europe, was to have placed him where he never could be again on the political arena of the world. In short, that he should have been dungeoned for life. How pretty is all this, in petty, in childish resentment; but how mighty foolish to attempt impossibilities.—The military power of Bonaparte, coupled with the resources of his vast mind, was greater at the time he signed the treaty of Fontainebleau than that of all Europe put together. It might be difficult to gain credit for this assertion, had not the recent expression of the military feeling of France in his favour incontrovertibly proved its correctness. It was reserved for the year 1815 to give, to the astonished world, an instance of a person who had incurred the remorseless reproaches, and indecent vilifications of the governing part of nations, being received, as it were by one heart and hand, by millions of a populace devoted to his military, his political, and his moral virtues. Ancient Rome furnishes instances of the military transferring the imperial diadem to favourite individuals; but then it was when the situation was vacillating between contending favourites. France presents a spectacle of receiving a *banished* Emperor into her bosom; of his traversing the extensive regions of that populous country, to the very capital, in a manner more like making a pleasureable excursion than as performing a hazardous enterprise; of his being every where openly caressed; of his finally reaching the seat of government without an opposing shot having been fired; and all this in the midst of some shew and much legislative prattle about heroic resistance to his progress. The Bourbon government thus summarily supplanted, was strong in *form* but wholly destitute of that *substantial*

power which is only to be found in the hearts of the governed. Legislators may strut in office, and talk largely, but without the authority emanating from public confidence, it dwindles into mere puppetism, and becomes the *Vox et præterea nihil*. A potentate like Bonaparte, seated in the rightful throne of his people's choice and attachment, cannot be shifted from his imperial eminence without an extent of carnage that can never be warranted, and which cannot be hazarded without drawing on its authors execration and ruin.

VERITAS.

INTERESTING DOCUMENTS.—In my last I had occasion to censure all our corrupt newspapers for *suppressing* the petition, and, some of them, the resolutions of the Livery of London against the threatened war with France. I accused them of publishing every thing calculated to inflame the public mind against the people and government of France, and to promote interminable war; I said that they carefully kept out of view all those arguments, those statements of fact, and those public documents which demonstrate the impolicy of hostilities, and furnish a clear and explicit exposition of the actual state of France, the stability of the government, and the devotion of the people to their present ruler. This I have repeatedly shown to be the way in which our corrupt press is almost universally conducted. I have now before me a remarkable proof of this, if any proof was wanting to establish the fact. A Sunday newspaper, entitled the *Postscript*, professing to be conducted on *liberal* principles, contained, in its last number, two documents, the one bearing to be a letter from Murat, king of Naples, to our Prince Regent, full of *pacific* sentiments, and the other a dispatch from the Duke of Otranto (Fouche) to Prince Metternich the Austrian Minister. This last I have given below. It will be read, I am sure, with great attention by all who deprecate war, and who are friendly to liberty. Nothing, indeed, could have been better written to expose the folly and futility of the arguments adduced by the war faction. But the ability which the writer has displayed, the conviction which every line carries with it of its truth, and the internal evidence which it bears of authenti-

city; all these concurring circumstances, however much they served to recommend this document to the notice of the conductors of our newspapers, seem to have been considered by this venal crew, as affording good cause for its suppression. Even the conductor of the *Morning Chronicle*, whose columns have lately been stuffed with, what he has been pleased to call, "Most important State Papers," but which no one else regarded in that light; at least, which possessed only a *secondary* character. Even, I say, the *penetrating*, the *impartial*, the *liberal* politician, Mr. Perry, could not, or rather *would* not, publish this interesting letter, in his *immaculate* journal. If he believed it a *forgery*, why not say so, and give his reasons for the assertion. If he considered it *genuine*, he merits execration for rejecting it. In refusing a place to a document of so much interest, he gives the most convincing proofs that he is influenced by base and sordid motives, and that all his boasted attachment to the people's rights, is mere pretence, mere hypocritical cant, which is the more pernicious that it is wrapt in the veil of sincerity and truth. The following is the letter to which I allude, and which, as far as I have been able to discover, has not appeared in any of our newspapers, except in the *Postscript* of the 7th instant.—I hope the conductor, or conductors, of that journal, whoever he or they may be, will meet that support, which his, or their impartiality, in this instance, merits.

*Copy of a Dispatch from the Duke of Otranto to Prince Metternich.*

MY PRINCE—Every event has confirmed what I predicted to you six months ago. You were too pre-occupied to hear me; hearken to me now with attention and confidence; we may, in the peculiar circumstances and the imminent situations in which we are placed, influence in a powerful manner, the approaching and perhaps eternal destinies of France, of Austria, and of Europe. You are deceived respecting what is going on, and what is preparing in the midst of us.—You will judge of the reports of a people rash and blinded by the misfortunes which strike without the power to enlighten them. You are given to understand at Vienna, that Napoleon has been brought back to



the throne by the army alone; that there are none on his side but a soldiery drunk with war. But forthwith you will know that our army has not been recruited in public houses. Generals, Captains, soldiers, all are drawn entirely from the bosom of the nation; and for 25 years our army has executed almost always their wishes and the laws by the most brilliant victories. How dare you tell us that it is the army alone which votes for Napoleon? Our legions do not range themselves more promptly under their colours than the Nation itself around his person and his throne. Almost every where on his route, the popular insurrections in his favour preceded the presence of Napoleon. The Bourbons, reduced to seek in every place a *Vendee*, have not found it even in *La Vendee* itself. Of so many armies of volunteers, which they said they had in the South, not one is formed; and though some little bands trembled while they had at their head the Duke of Angouleme, they are become intrepid by passing under the tri-coloured flag. The power of the nation consists in its talents as much as in its armed force. They think now, or they express themselves with respect to Napoleon, in the same manner in the towns, in the academies, and in the camps. Without doubt, liberty has been much restricted, but it has never been destroyed. Glory, at least, was a compensation for France; she desired not aggrandisements of which we abjure the abuse; but she was not able to support the abasement when she had thrown off the government of the Bourbons. The French people feel the extreme want of peace, they wish it as they wish for happiness; but if they be forced into a war, they believe that, under Napoleon, they will not suffer disgrace. We do not wish, say the Powers assembled in Congress, to oblige France to take the Bourbons again; but Napoleon will not be recognised by us. France must choose another Chief; for, to restrict her, they add, we shall have, if necessary, 900,000 men.—I shall not stop to discuss here the principles of the rights of nations: it is too evident that they are all violated by a similar pretention. The Emperor Napoleon may demand from the Emperor of Russia, from the Emperor of Austria, from the King of Prussia, in what manner he has merited from them, a hatred so violent, as

to cause them to believe that they owe nothing to the justice which is due to all other men, and that in consideration of their personal hatred to Napoleon, they are authorised to rob the French of the sacred right of their independence, absolute and without limit, in the choice of the Chief of the Empire.—Victory has several times placed the political existence of the Powers of the North at the mercy of the Emperor Napoleon, and he has not wished to erase any one of them from the lists of nations. It is the wish of Alexander, whose name is revered amongst us, to dispense with our rendering to his virtues the homage which they merit? Does the Emperor of Austria, in dethroning, contrary to his interests and those of his monarchy, his son-in-law, and his grand-son, wish to prove to the world, by the most astonishing and authentic of all examples, that among the most hideous of all the sentiments of human nature, hatred is that which has the greatest sway over kings? The people are not disposed to believe it: and in this age of revolutions it might be better to take care to dissuade them from it. In short, my Prince, when it shall be beyond doubt that France is resolved to display all her forces, to expose all her destinies to support on his throne the man who is the object of her pride, who alone seems to her capable of guaranteeing all the existences and all the relations proceeding from Revolution; will the Princes at the Congress make the attempt, perhaps a vain one, to tear him from his throne, at the price of all the torrents of blood which this new war will cause to be spilled?—What pretexts will cover so many outrages on reason, on justice, and on humanity?—They pretend that Napoleon cannot offer any guarantee with respect to the durability of the peace of Europe; but what a strange mode of seeking this guarantee, to commence their research by replunging Europe in all the fury and horrors of war!—On the contrary, every thing announces, every thing establishes, that any Prince in Europe, at the present time, cannot give this guarantee of peace in the same degree as Napoleon.—No one has experienced so many dangers and vicissitudes of war, so many unexpected and terrible reverses, as Napoleon.—It is, in fact, a new life, as well as a new reign, which the Emperor Napoleon commences,

after having understood, during a year, in the Island of Elba, as in a tomb, every thing which truth as well as hatred, has told in Europe, respecting his first reign and his first life.—In fine, my Prince, France has given herself a new Constitution, which will not be a vain charter. It is no longer possible to use subtilty and deceit. The force of things will necessarily bring order and justice into social life.—Our Constitution constitutes two Chambers. The sittings in both will be public. Thus France and Europe will understand every thing which will be said on peace and war; and every war, which shall not be one of justice and evident necessity, shall paralyse with terror the man who would kindle it in Europe, already bleeding from so many wars.—The coalesced Powers plume themselves on the immense number of men which they can collect. But, perhaps they may have calculated erroneously—they may be deceived. If it were true, as they give out, that they have 900,000 men, fit for action, France, who has already 500,000, will soon have a million. I seek not to exaggerate the exultation which, in a similar war, will fix all the senses, and the enthusiasm with which their souls will be transported. Every man in France will become a soldier; every article of iron will be fabricated into a sabre, a bayonet, or a musket, every where, as in 1793, will be established manufactories of salt-petre, of powder, and of cannon.—From the Rhine to the Pyrennees, from the Mediterranean to the Ocean, the diversions of the peasants, on Sundays and holidays, will be military exercises; every commune, every village will be transformed into barracks; and the entire population of the Empire, arrayed as the National Guards, will be prepared to live in tents.—Already does France resound with war-songs, in which the acquirers of national domains, who harbour fears for their property; the friends of reason, who have been threatened with the return of superstition; the military, whose glory they have wished to tarnish; in short, all classes of citizens repeat with enthusiasm their ardent expressions of passions the most dear, and the most terrible.—In this war, which will be, in fact, a crusade against the independence of a nation, the contagion of the principles of the French Revolution, may find their way amongst people too igno-

rant and too barbarous even to understand their own interests. On the approach of the Emperor Napoleon, and his armies, marching with animation to songs of liberty, Kings may be abandoned by their subjects, as the Bourbons have been by the soldiers on whom they depended with such confidence. Every throne will be subverted before kings will learn how to govern; and how many evils will be the work of Princes, capable by their virtues of rendering happy the greatest part of the world.—How much will those Monarchs and humanity be indebted to you, my Prince, if, by the wisdom of your counsels, you can dissuade them from the determination, in which they oppose interests and passions over which they ought to have no controul.—I have only to renew, with the most lively expression, to your Highness, the assurances of the highest consideration.

(Signed) **THE DUKE OF OTRANTO.**  
Paris, April 23, 1815.

#### LETTER FROM MR. BIRKBECK.

*Wanborough, May 4, 1815.*

SIR—The little work which has received your favourable notice is now going through a fourth edition. The appendix to the first, which I take the liberty of sending you, was printed separately for the accommodation of the purchasers of the first.

It is due to you as well as to myself to state, that I don't feel myself called upon by the new position which Napoleon has assumed, to qualify the terms in which I have censured the principles of his former government, because I am quite convinced that they were hostile to the best interests of his people, and perfectly inconsistent with political freedom.

I should have lamented as sincerely as I now rejoice at his restoration, had he, like Louis, recovered the throne unconstructed by adversity, or through any other means than the consent of the people, *conditionally* granted.

Infatuated by success, he forgot that he owed it to the energies of a nation struggling for freedom; and, mixing himself with kings, he became a foe to that liberty from which he derived his greatness. He now acknowledges his error, and, if it be in good faith, it is an instance of magnanimity new to the page of history.



The acts of his government have hitherto corresponded with these fair professions; and, as a pledge of their sincerity, he has received into his councils men of sound principles, and whose integrity he had himself exposed to the severest proof.

This consummation of the late *glorious contest*, though far more glorious than any which its most sanguine supporters have even imagined, is not entirely to the satisfaction of the old governments. They had rather see Bonaparte at the head of his army than surrounded by wise and just counsellors; and they are right. He is, in his present attitude, more formidable to the "social system," as exemplified in the late Congress at Vienna, than when he was thundering at the gates of that capital.

But why *the people* should be disturbed at the view of Napoleon in his present attitude, I don't understand, unless, indeed, their comforts depend on the security of two or three thrones, and the insecurity of the rest, according to the principles established at the said Congress. Yours, &c.

MORRIS BIRKBECK.

#### THE ENDYMION AND PRESIDENT FRIGATES.

When the news of the capture of the latter of these vessels reached this country, it was given out by our corrupt press, that she had surrendered to the former, with whom she had fought *single-handed*, and that no other of our ships of war had fired a shot at the President. This was trumpeted abroad by the *Times* and the *Courier*, and never to this hour has any of these venal prints retracted the assertion. On the contrary, they repeated it, again and again, and gravely assured their readers, that the result of the conflict betwixt the President and the Endymion, had redeemed all the naval glory which this country had lost during the previous contest at sea with the Americans! I was satisfied, on the first blush of the transaction, that the President had been engaged with more of our frigates than one, and, instead of the enemy losing any of the renown he had acquired, that this battle, when the particulars came fully to be known, would increase the splendour of his achievements. I said to those with whom I conversed on the subject, that I was willing to abide by the account of the battle, as given by Captain Hope of

the Endymion, which, no one ever doubted, would be published in the Gazette. The Gazette appeared; but it contained no particulars from Captain Hope as to the actual engagement, or any detail by which it could be ascertained whether he fought the President single handed or not, or whether that ship surrendered to the Endymion or to another vessel belonging to our squadron. But from other accounts in the same Gazette, and particularly from the American official account, it turned out, as I had supposed, that more than one of our frigates was engaged; that the Pomone also had fought with the enemy; that it was to this ship the President actually struck; and that at the very moment this happened, a ship of the line, another frigate, and a sloop of war, belonging to us, were fast bearing down to attack her. It was plain, therefore, that the President had not surrendered to the Endymion, but that she surrendered to a *British squadron*, consisting of one sail of the line, three frigates and a sloop of war! It was also clear, that had the President and the Endymion fought single handed, the latter must have fallen into the hands of the former. Where then was the ground for exultation? Where the proof, that the capture of the President "redeemed all the naval glory" which this country had lost during the "previous contest at sea with the Americans?" I see, by files of papers which I have received from Philadelphia, that the conductors of newspapers at Bermuda, had imitated the example of our vile press, and had, like them, endeavoured to detract from the character of Commodore Decatur, by representing that he had surrendered the President to a single British frigate. To expose the fallacy of this statement, the American Commodore addressed a letter to the Secretary of the Navy, an extract of which I have given below. This letter puts it beyond all question, that the President was considered, even by the commander of our own fleet, as a capture *by the squadron*, and not by a single ship. It proves that the Endymion had on board, *in addition to her usual complement*, 50 men, one lieutenant, and one masters' mate, which shews that the *crew* of the Endymion, the chief reliance of every vessel of war, was more numerous than that of her rival. It also proves that the Endymion was completely

disabled in the action, and would, it is more than probable, have become a prize to the President, had not the rest of our squadron come to her relief.

WASHINGTON, March 14.

*Extract of a letter from Com. Stephen Decatur to the Secretary of the Navy, dated New York, March 6th, 1815.*

"In my official letter of the 18th January, I omitted to state, that a considerable number of my killed and wounded was from the fire of the *Pomone*; and that the *Endymion* had on board, in addition to her own crew, one Lieutenant, one Master's mate, and 50 men belonging to the *Saturn*, and when the action ceased, was left motionless and unmanagable until she bent new sails, rove new rigging and fished her spars, nor did she rejoin the squadron for six hours after the action, and three hours after the surrender of the President. My sword was delivered to Capt. Hays, of the *Majestic*, the senior officer of the squadron, on his quarter-deck, which he with great politeness immediately returned. I have the honor to enclose you my parole, by which you will perceive that the British admit that the President was captured by the squadron. I should have deemed it necessary to have drawn your attention to this document, had not the fact been stated differently by the Bermuda Gazette on our arrival there, which statement, however, the editor was compelled to retract through the interference of the governor and some of the British officers of the squadron."

After the disastrous retreat of the British army at New Orleans, General Jackson, the American commander, published an animated and spirited Address to his army. The following passages will shew with what ardour and unanimity the soldiers of Liberty will always combat, when their rights and independence are in danger:—

"*Citizens and Fellow Soldiers*.—The enemy has retreated and your General has now time to proclaim to the world what he has noticed with admiration and pride—your undaunted courage, your patriotism, and patience under hardships

and fatigues. Natives of different states acting together for the first time in this camp; differing in habits and in language, instead of viewing in these circumstances the germ of distrust and division, you have made them the source of an honourable emulation, and from the seeds of discord itself have reaped the fruits of an honourable union.—This day completes the fourth week since fifteen hundred of you attacked treble your number of men who boasted of their discipline, and their services under a celebrated leader in a long and eventful war—attacked them in their camp the moment they had profaned the soil of freedom with their hostile trade, and inflicted a blow which was a prelude to the final result of their attempt to conquer, or their poor contrivances to divide us.—A few hours was sufficient to unite the gallant band; at the moment they received the welcome order to march they were separated many leagues in different directions from the city. The gay rapidity of the march, the cheerful countenances of the officers and men, would have induced a belief that some festive entertainment, not the strife of battle, was the object to which they hastened with so much eagerness and hilarity. In the conflict that ensued, the same spirit was supported, and my communications to the executive of the United States, have testified the sense I entertained of the corps and officers that were engaged. Resting on the field of battle, they retired in perfect order on the next morning to these lines, destined to become the scene of future victories, which they were to share with the rest of you, my brave companions in arms.—Reasoning always from false principles the enemy expected little opposition from men whose officers even were not in uniform; who were ignorant of the rules of dress, and who had never been caned into discipline—Fatal mistake! a fire incessantly kept up, directed with calmness and with unerring aim, strewed the field with the brave officers and men of the column which slowly advanced, according to the most approved rules of European tactics, and was cut down by the untutored age of American militia.